HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 15 Thursday, April 14, 1960 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

VEEP POLL: *Chairmen speak* ..... (page 1)

WISCONSIN: *Kennedy stalled* ..... (page 1)

SOUND DOLLAR: *Oklahoman's program* .... (page 2)

AFRICA: *Where humans are yummy* ..... (page 3)

MORRIS: *Victory chances brighten* ..... (page 4)

Goldwater to the Fore: In early but substantial returns from a poll of Republican county chairmen, Senator Barry Goldwater runs first as choice for Vice Presidential candidate on the GOP ticket. HUMAN EVENTS sent out questionnaires to 3405 Republican County Chairmen, listing eight Republican figures who have indicated interest in receiving the No. 2 position.

They are: Senator Goldwater of Arizona; Congressman Halleck of Indiana; Governor Hatfield of Oregon; Senator Keating of New York; United Nations Ambassador Lodge; Labor Secretary Mitchell; Senator Scott of Pennsylvania; Interior Secretary Seaton.

A total of 904 returns (to date) reveals Senator Goldwater in the lead with 228 votes, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge running a close second with 224 votes.

In the questionnaire, the county chairmen were asked by HUMAN EVENTS to name—in confidence—their choice for Vice President. The questionnaire excluded Governor Nelson Rockefeller, saying that he has stated that under no circumstances will he allow himself to be drafted for the Vice Presidency. It also quoted Vice President Nixon as saying that geographical considerations should not be a factor in choosing a Vice President.

The results of the first 904 votes received up to Thursday, April 7, were as follows:

(Listed alphabetically)	Northeast	Midwest	West	South and Border	Total
Goldwater	14	82	43	89	228
Halleck	1	80	7	54	142
Hatfield	3	1	7	5	16
Keating	9	7	4	21	41
Lodge	57	47	26	94	224
Mitchell	16	15	2	17	50
Scott	16	6	0	9	31
Seaton	0	55	11	10	76

Write Ins: Rockefeller 54, Morton 14, Others 28.

There were no returns from Alaska, Hawaii or the territories. There were a total of 96 write-ins, notably 54 for Rockefeller and 14 for Senator Thruston Morton of Kentucky (who is also Chairman of the Republican National Committee). Other information of interest: 33 of the 142 votes for Halleck were from Indiana; 37 of the 76 votes for Seaton were from Nebraska and Kansas (Seaton's family owns radio stations and newspapers in both states).

Goldwater's showing draws unusual attention for the reason that, at the time the questionnaires were distributed, his name had rarely appeared in political news or magazine stories discussing the possible contenders for the vice-presidential nomination. Almost all wire service or columnist lists of No. 2 hopefuls had omitted the Arizonan's name, although on a number of occasions he has publicly mentioned his interest in being chosen for second place on the ticket.

The Goldwater strength in the HUMAN EVENTS poll of county chairmen, therefore, comes as a surprise, on top of another surprise which was as scantily reported in the press two weeks ago. That was the action of the South Carolina GOP convention in pledging its delegation to vote for Goldwater, not Nixon, for the GOP Presidential nomination in the Republican National Convention to be held in Chicago on July 25.

The strength of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. also draws no little comment, and some surprise. Among those GOP politicians who carefully studied the results of the Eisenhower victory sweep in 1952, many recall that Lodge, then seeking re-election as Senator from Massachusetts, was soundly beaten by John F. Kennedy, now front runner for the Democratic presidential nomination. Lodge since 1953 has figured in the press limelight and on TV as US Ambassador to the UN. Also, his name has appeared in the press on almost all lists of possible VP candidates.

Brakes on the Bandwagon: The tires screeched as news from Wisconsin reached the Capital last week. Speaker Sam Rayburn in an aside to a reporter remarked that the primary election outcome in that state has applied the brakes to what had been expected to be a forward lurch for Senator Kennedy's bandwagon. Few in Washington would disagree with that estimate.

The fact that the codfish legislator had won only a limited victory raised more problems for him than it solved: (1) Expectation of a formidable "stop Kennedy" coalition among his rivals, which could cause him complications; and (2) the rather clear evidence that he might well have suffered disaster without the support of the "Catholic vote" (a phenomenon, on a national scale, that looms as a two-edged sword for the Massachusetts man).

Indeed, among the industrious students of election statistics in the Capital, one comes up with the following thesis: Since Catholics are about 30 per cent of the Badger state's population, and since Kennedy won only about 40 per cent of the total (both party) vote, the result suggests infinite trouble for Kennedy on a national scale, in a predominantly non-Catholic country.

Everyone on Capitol Hill today watches for signs of a stop-Kennedy coalition. Projections of its possible

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaders sound impressive: (1) Speaker Rayburn (boosting Lyndon Johnson); (2) former President Harry Truman; (3) Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Spring book-makers say these leaders may be getting behind Senator Humphrey in the upcoming (May 10) primary in West Virginia—an acid test for Kennedy. Around the town, they say the coalition will enjoy the formidable talents of former Democratic Finance Chairman Louis Johnson of that state, the man who provided Harry Truman with the money for his victory in 1948. Louis Johnson, reportedly, favors Senator Lyndon Johnson for nominee, but would get behind Humphrey as a "stalking horse."

On the other hand, two sons of the late F. D. R. are said to be working on "Mother" to drop her opposition to Kennedy. The two sons are Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Congressman James Roosevelt. *

Additionally, the question rises: what will Reuther do? Kennedy has played Reuther's game faithfully, in his voting in the Senate and his ideology, despite his pretense that he is a "moderate liberal." Reuther stayed aloof in Wisconsin. But now Reuther's price for support goes up. It is expected that a big deal between the two men will take place. It may be hard, then, for Kennedy even to utter the word "moderate."

A former GOP Senator, traditionally for Nixon, made this morning-after remark: "Wisconsin, home of political graveyards (remember Willkie), may be the graveyard of three men: Humphrey, Kennedy and Nixon. For the outcome in Wisconsin does not enhance the Vice President's chances. He can only correct this situation by dropping his 'high level' posture and 'liberal image,' and come out fighting as a real Republican on issues."

One analysis: The Democratic nomination hopefuls have been fighting each other on the plane of "personalities," never on issues. Thus "crew-cut kid" battled "Minnesota hayseed" in Wisconsin—but with no real argument on issues, for they are both left-wing ADA-type politicos. Meanwhile, both (as well as Symington and Lyndon Johnson) continue to fight the GOP and Nixon on the plane of issues. It can't go on—say many friends of Nixon, who add that if the VP had told Wisconsin folks (as he was advised by many) that on the record both Humphrey and Jack were identical, many vital Republican cross-over votes for Kennedy would never have occurred.

Left-Foot Kickoff: On the day of the GOP campaign kickoff jamboree in Washington, April 4, Republican National Chairman Thruston Morton was informed that actor Howard Da Silva (who took the First and Fifth Amendments before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951) was to appear before Ike, Nixon, and 7,000 Republicans as a featured entertainer.

Morton conferred with Senator Barry Goldwater on the matter. Goldwater, as chairman of the Republican Senate Campaign Committee, was a sponsor of the affair with Morton and GOP House Campaign Committee Chairman Miller. Goldwater urged that Da Silva be excused, and Morton so requested the professional entertainment organization which booked Da Silva.

During the day word had filtered through Republican circles that Da Silva could well have been a "plant"—placed on the program in order to embarrass the GOP if the Communist issue arises during the campaign.

But Da Silva went on anyway, much to the unhappy surprise of the Senators. No small blame for this development is going to Republican National Committee subordinates, who helped set up the show.

A friend of HUMAN EVENTS, one of the first to spot Da Silva's name among the performers, reported the following conversation with a high committee source: "I told this person that, as a Young Republican, I was concerned over the scheduled appearance, because Howard Da Silva had been identified on at least three occasions as a member of the Communist party, and had invoked the First and Fifth Amendments to questions along this line.

"The reply was: 'So what? If Howard Da Silva were behind bars, he wouldn't be able to appear tonight. If he isn't behind bars, then he hasn't done anything wrong, and he is more than welcome at any time.' "

It is recalled here that Charlie Chaplin is not in jail, but runs free in Switzerland, and perhaps his services might be sought as part of the entertainment for the 1961 Inaugural Ball, if this unthinking attitude continues.

Knowledgeable anti-Communists point out that Da Silva has had no public change of attitude to this day, and are thankful that conservative sources aired this unfortunate flub within their camp before the "liberals" grabbed it for election year ammunition.

"Sound Dollar, Ltd.": While many of those pushing for a "sound dollar" and a balanced Budget are scattering their shot by generalized "education" campaigns, one man in Oklahoma shows convincing confidence that the the public knows the score and needs only to be aroused.

Three months ago an Oklahoma City science teacher named Bayard Auchincloss decided to "throw all of my efforts and abilities into a crash program to awaken the citizens of this country to the perils of inflation." He set up offices at 106 W. Main Street in Oklahoma City and began circulating petitions, hoping to get 50,000 to 100,000 signatures urging a "sound dollar."

Now, Auchincloss says he is "astonished" by his popular support. "I don't have to say much; people are very eager to do something. We're shooting for two million signatures by the end of the summer. People keep asking for more petitions—and they write from all over the country. We've sent out auto stickers and postcards; now we're starting a postcard campaign in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget and national debt reduction. People say the cards are just what they've been looking for."

* Junior reportedly has been promised appointment as Secretary of the Navy. It will be remembered that both T. R. and F. D. R. were once Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many on Capitol Hill are hopeful that the Oklahoman's drive may be the "sound dollar crusade" so urgently needed here, if Congress is to achieve a Budget reduction of any size. Already time is growing short—and the House last week raised the Health, Education and Welfare appropriation request by $200 million, to a record $4.2 billion, thus putting any possible tax relief still farther in the distant future.

Inside Africa: In the Capital, concern about the primitive character of most of the upcoming African independent states is fed by an increasing number of reports of cannibalism. Such reports arise not from isolated instances in remote areas, but touch the very centers of the newly-created "republics."

(1) Diplomatic Row, drawing on French sources, reports the appalling case of Member of Parliament Broka Bota, said to be one of the "finest" law-givers in the legislature of the Republic of the Ivory Coast (given self-government by France in 1958, and reported to be readying its application to join the United Nations). M. Broka Bota failed to appear recently for a session of the Ivory Coast legislature; he had disappeared. Police investigators went to his constituency and found that he had been killed and eaten by constituents. The latter indicated that they admired Bota, in fact so much so that they had killed and eaten him so as to absorb some of his "fine" qualities.

Diplomats who know Africa say that cannibalism is prevalent in much of "black Africa," particularly in the West and Central portions.

(2) Nationally-syndicated columnist Robert Ruark, in a column printed in the Washington *Daily News* on April 4, reporting from Mushenge, Belgian Congo (which will soon be given independence by the Belgian Government), describes an interview with King Nymi Lukengu, one of the two kings of the Bakuba tribes. "He wore," reports Ruark, "around his neck what appeared to be a choker of human arm sinew. This is still cannibal country here, for all its politics, and one may not become a chief until he has eaten men—perhaps not as a steady diet, but at least symbolically, ritually."

Belgian Congo, when freed, is said to be slated to be one of the many UN applicants from among these new states. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge is reported to be an enthusiast for admission of such states to the United Nations and last winter made a tour of Africa to get acquainted with their leaders.

(HUMAN EVENTS announces for publication on April 21, a study of the UN, its record for the past 15 years and the problems coming up in view of admission of many Asian and African states, by Dr. Edna Fluegel, Professor of History at Trinity College.)

Cuba: The most forceful utterance on the Castro mess came from Florida Senator George Smathers via a Mutual radiocast last week.

Scotching the State Department theory that firm anti-Castro action by the United States might alienate the rest of Latin America, Smathers stated: "That's an argument that is not supported by the facts; anyone who has had any experience in Latin America will tell you that the one thing that the Latins respect and admire above everything else is decisiveness and firmness—they are completely bewildered by this soft attitude which the United States Government has adopted toward Castro. They cannot understand why it is that we would treat him so softly and so preferentially when he abuses us and brags about the Communists all the time . . . . We're making them lose respect for us, and they're beginning to look to other nations for leadership."

Smathers also scored official US discouragement of Cuban groups wishing to overthrow Fidel. He pointed out that in the past exiles from Latin revolutions were allowed free run in Florida. Now all known anti-Castro Cubans are removed 150 miles from the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean.

Smathers' immediate suggestions: pull back Ambassador Philip Bonsal and keep him here as long as the bearded badman retains power, and reduce Cuba's portion of the sugar quota ("I cannot believe that it's wise for us to give preferential treatment to those people who despise us apparently and who do not wish to do business.").

Foreign Aid: Chairman Otto E. Passman (D.-La.) last week charged that "shocking" pressures have been brought against his House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid to block the Congress from chopping down the Administration's $4.2 billion request for the mutual security program.

The pressures, he states, came from a whole host of groups: "The 43,000 employees and 10,000 trainees of the mutual security program scattered in 76 nations of the world; the White House . . . ; the State Department . . . ; the Defense Department; scores of large manufacturers who profit from the program; colleges and universities which also profit from the program; church organizations; much of the press and radio; and literally hundreds of other organizations which have been misinformed . . . . "

He said further that "the total foreign aid cost, including interest on what we have borrowed to give away, now exceeds $10 *billion annually," and total funds, unexpended and new, available under the mutual security program for fiscal* 1960 *are in excess of* $8 *billion.*

Labor: A vigorous attempt to re-establish secondary boycotts in the building industry is being made by Senator John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.).

Secondary boycotts in the construction industry were outlawed by both the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin labor laws because of their inherent inequities and improper use by corrupt unions.

But White House hopeful Kennedy has now chosen to author a bill permitting secondary boycotts, apparently changing his mind since last year, when he opposed an amendment to his labor bill which would have legalized these boycotts. On April 21, 1959, he explicitly stated he

MAKE A LIST OF FRIENDS and associates who ought to be stimulated into activity in the coming Presidential campaign. Send them HUMAN EVENTS. Special rate $4.75 for the term from now until December 15. A card listing you as donor will be sent with the first issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was against the secondary boycott in the building industry (known as "common situs" picketing).

On March 14 he readily assured the legislative conference of the Building Trades unions he would try to get his bill passed this session. And he has already seen that one, based on his own, has been introduced in the House by Congressman Thompson of New Jersey.

Under Kennedy's bill (S. 2643), *for example, a union wanting to organize a nonunion plumbing outfit working with a number of other firms on a construction project could ring the whole project—not just the plumbing outfit as is permitted now—with a picket line. Workers in the unionized firms have, in the past, honored the picket line, thus halting construction.*

Since labor experts note the Building Trades unions use the boycott primarily to force the construction industry to use only union labor, Kennedy's bill, they say, brings back the closed shop, which is completely opposed to the letter and spirit of the Nation's labor law.

The "Liberal" Double Standard: The Institute of Pacific Relations, long headed by Owen Lattimore and advocating the Communist line in China during the 1930's and '40's, has been given back its tax-exempt status as a "non-profit educational and research group."

The IPR and Lattimore came under heavy fire from the Senate Internal Security Committee when the committee was headed by the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada. The committee branded Lattimore a "conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy," while IPR's continual plugs for Mao Tse-tung as an "agrarian reformer" were regarded as a key force in making Truman and Acheson unwilling to aid Chiang Kai-shek.

Many who have followed the activities of IPR over the years expressed dismay when they learned of Judge David N. Edelstein's decision. These observers point out that under a thin veneer of doing "scholarly research," IPR has continued to advocate the Communist line in the Far East, calling for recognition of Red China, and that despite a much-publicized "house-cleaning" when it was under fire, IPR still includes many of the same persons it had in the old Lattimore days. And while Judge Edelstein has given IPR tax-exempt status, this privilege has been denied the Committee of One Million, which upholds US foreign policy in not recognizing Mao.

But the most blatant example of the left-wing's "double standard" is represented by Judge Edelstein himself. For in 1953, when the Jolles Foundation lost its tax-exempt status after distributing a booklet written by Senator McCarthy, the Foundation sued the Internal Revenue Service to regain the privilege. The case came before the same Judge Edelstein, who then ruled that he had no jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Service and threw the case out of court.

Under what law, many in Washington are asking, can Judge Edelstein give tax-exemption to a left-wing foundation and claim he has no authority to judge a case involving a right-wing foundation?

Recognize Red China?: No, says Roy Howard, Editor of the New York *World Telegram and Sun*, after a trip through the Orient. Summing up his off-the-record talks with US, British and Asian leaders, Howard writes:

"In the opinion of political leaders, businessmen and journalists of all the free countries of the Far East, recognition of Red China by the US would be suicidal for the basic interests of the US and the free world.

" . . . it is possible to report without equivocation that no American Government representative, functioning anywhere between Turkey and Japan, expressed anything other than repugnance toward the idea that the US should recognize Red China, or fail to veto her admission to the UN.

"British businessmen, government officials and journalists in Hong Kong strongly oppose American recognition of Peiping. Many of these men, who a few years ago advocated such action by the British, today admit it was a grave mistake."

Howard's report is echoed by Congressman Walter Judd (R.-Minn.), who spent many years as a missionary in China and toured the Far East last fall. Says Judd: "If we recognize Red China, the free nations in the Far East will have to recognize her also. In effect, we will be giving the Reds a free rein in taking over the rest of Asia—including Japan." Judd also reports a statement by all the US Ambassadors in the Far East, who unanimously opposed Red China recognition—a distinct change of opinion in the last five years.

Morris on the Move: Bob Morris not only has Senator Clifford Case, the candidate of the ADA, "running scared" in their contest for the New Jersey GOP Senate nomination, but many impartial Garden State observers now predict what they previously considered a long shot —a Morris victory in the April 19 primary.

Reports have it that the big scare began to hit Case's camp early in March. At that time a string of Republican county organizations, led off by pivotal Bergen, voted to stay neutral. The Case people were shocked at this, especially since the Senator's home county of Union was among them. Next came the realization that the Morris forces were showing far more organizational strength than the various "liberals"—symbolized by "One Worlder" Paul Hoffman—who surround Case.

Evidence that the Case slide is no "flash in the pan" continually comes from stories in the Jersey press. Typical is a Bergen *Evening Record* item of March 18: "Three weeks ago Case was considered a shoo-in by all but the most inveterate Morris enthusiasts. Other observers would go no farther than to say that Morris might do better than originally expected. [Now] some Case boosters are leaning heavily on the panic button . . . . "

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.
For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.
Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 15—Article Section I HUMAN EVENTS April 14, 1960

Senator Douglas of Illinois

The 'Liberal' Light That Failed

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By WILLARD EDWARDS
(Capitol Hill correspondent for the Chicago Tribune)

SOME MEN GROW rapidly in stature after they enter public office. The majority gain, at least, some wisdom and experience from its responsibilities.

Rarely does public service shrink a man. When it does, the spectacle is depressing. Such a one is Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, seeking this year a third term in a chamber which he entered 11 years ago amid happy prophecies that he would become a legislative giant.

Douglas was then an individual of intellectual attainments and reputation, boomed by an approving press as Presidential material. He was hailed as a philosophical spokesman for the New and Fair Deals of Roosevelt and Truman. In 1951, he was picked by Democratic state leaders in a nationwide poll as their first choice for the Presidential nomination in 1952 if Harry Truman chose not to run again.

Today, no member of the Senate, other than a few raw freshmen, has less influence. He has coasted downhill with the passage of years until the mention of his name evokes tired amusement among those once eager to install him in the White House.

Here is a seeming mystery which quickly disappears upon examination of the Douglas career. It is a tale of self-deflation; of one who sought publicity as an advocate of petty economies while clamoring for inflationary legislation. He revealed himself as a man of uncontrollable emotions who visualized himself surrounded by "a multitude of enemies," to use his own phrase.

Even the Senate "liberals" of the Morse-Humphrey persuasion, who once glimpsed a potential leader in the former professor of economics, eventually shied away from his erratic floor forays which seemed not only to invite but court defeat.

"After all these years, he never seems to have learned the score," commented a veteran, after watching Douglas in action. "I hate to say it of a man of 68, but I don't think he ever grew up."

But there are too many inconsistencies and contradictions in the Douglas record to blame them all on immaturity. In two successful election campaigns (1948 and 1954) he cynically tailored his speeches to the audiences in his home state, promising the farmers higher price supports, the city folks a battle against inflation. He seemed, in fact, to be following a recipe for political success which he once attributed, with appropriate expressions of horror, to some of his colleagues:

"Call loudly for economy in speeches, vote for every appropriation that comes along, and vote against every tax bill."

The *Congressional Record* carries abundant evidence that Douglas has improved upon his formula. He proposes and votes for small cuts in spending which are usually defeated. Then he supports vast, inflationary money measures.

A typical instance in this Congress: Douglas last year made the front pages with a floor attack upon President Eisenhower's maintenance fund for the White House, seeking to shave off $675,000 for White House limousines and similar "extravagances." He was, as usual, beaten 79 to 2.

On the same day, he voted with the majority which added $363 million to an Eisenhower request for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This was an amount more than 500 times greater than the sum he proposed to save.

There are other inconsistencies in the record. In 1952, *Douglas wrote a book called* Ethics In Government, *in which he gained wide publicity by announcing his personal code for scorning any sideline profits connected with a Senator's position. If a present was sent him which cost more than* $2.50, *he disclosed, piously, he sent it back.*

The Library of Congress made a survey for the 1953-1954 session of Congress which revealed the lucrative gains of a number of Senators who engaged in the practice of writing magazine articles.

Douglas was the unquestioned champion. He contributed a total of 26 articles in the two-year period, three to the high-paying *Reader's Digest,* and others to the *Saturday Evening Post, Colliers, Harpers, American* magazine, *Atlantic Monthly, Coronet* and the *New York Times Magazine.* A conservative estimate of his earnings from these sources would range between $15,000 and $20,000.

There are dozens of similar incidents. Senator Homer Capehart (R.-Ind.) once told his colleagues plaintively: "I am always reading about the Senator from Illinois as an economy advocate. He favors cutting out the small items but always votes for the big ones. I just don't understand."

Capehart and his colleagues did, of course, understand. They know that slashes in spending bills are accomplished in the appropriations committees of Congress and not on the Senate floor, amid a flurry of oratory and publicity.

Any legislator, sincerely desiring economy, pushes his case in the committee which works many months to whittle a money bill down to size. When the bill reaches the floor, the House or Senate almost invariably accepts the committee's recommendations.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disillusionment thus set in early among those conservatives on both sides of the aisle who had been temporarily encouraged by the wide acclaim given to Douglas for uttering this admirable maxim: "To be a liberal, one does not have to be wasteful."

The "liberals" clung to Douglas for a longer period. They agreed with the *New Republic,* which is sometimes astonishingly frank about its heroes. This leftist weekly proclaimed:

"He [Douglas] can express radical views as moderately as anyone in Congress. It is doubtful if he is really much to the right of Humphrey or Pepper yet he has a mellowness about him that is deceptive."

A BIZARRE INCIDENT on the Senate floor September 10, 1951, persuaded most of the Senate that Douglas was hardly the man to carry the Democratic standard in 1952. Douglas was making a speech on military waste when he was prodded by a bosom friend, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney (D.-Wyo.), for apparently showing a lack of faith in American military leaders—an attitude which might give comfort to Communist propagandists.

The needling was mild by Senate standards. Its effect upon Douglas was startling. He raised his arms, lifted his face to the ceiling and uttered a hysterical scream. He stumbled from the chamber and collapsed on a couch in the Senate lounge, raving that he had never expected such an attack from a friend.

It has been more than eight years since Douglas let out that shriek on the Senate floor. He has, on occasion, wept during speeches but he does it without sound effects. He is still prone to emotional outbursts off the floor.

In March of this year, he called a press conference during the civil rights debate. He suddenly interrupted an explanation of the "liberal" position by standing up, pounding the table with great flailing arm sweeps, and shouting to startled reporters:

"Tell your editors we mean business, God damn it, we mean business."

The most important role now enjoyed by Douglas is that of chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. He had a priceless opportunity in a $200,000 study of employment, growth and price levels to establish economic facts and data in an area where fundamental knowledge was meager.

What emerged, after a year of hearings, was a political document confined to changes that had occurred during the Eisenhower Administration, ignoring long-range trends, and proposing a series of Government spending programs which, in the words of Senator John Marshall Butler (R.-Md.), speaking for the minority, would, if enacted into law, force the United States into "national bankruptcy and ruinous inflation."

The decline of Douglas in the Senate has not been matched by a comparable impairment of political standing back home. He is again unopposed in the Democratic primary and has the backing of the Chicago political machine which has twice sent him to the Senate.

He has proved a tireless campaigner in the past. A hulking, white-haired six feet two inches, a Quaker with a fine war record, he has a gift for informal speech which conflicts with his academic background and appeals to the voters.

The ineptitude of the Republican opposition has made things easy for him in past campaigns. In 1954, he was aided in defeating Joseph Meek, the GOP candidate, because Meek suffered from the defection of many voters who thought he refused to take a firm enough stand on the McCarthy censure issue that year.

The mellow deceptiveness, which the *New Republic* found so admirable, was employed to the full by Douglas in this connection. He told the Illinois voters he would keep an "open mind" on McCarthy's censure in a post-election session. This didn't square with his vote of August 2 when he joined the Senate's most determined anti-McCarthyites in an attempt to get an immediate censure vote. But it served its purpose, keeping the voters in the dark.

The major theme pounded by Douglas in that campaign was one of fear. He saw sprouting "the seeds of a full scale depression" and urged emergency spending and tax cutting "if the cumulative forces of economic breakdown continue."

The 1954 recession leveled off and recovery got under way. By 1956, Douglas was denying he had ever predicted a depression. But in January, 1958, he was jubilant. With another recession blossoming, he wanted everybody to know he had been right all the time. Now, he told the National Women's Democratic Club, he was simply a man before his time. He was again in full cry, glimpsing "a slight blaze that shows signs of turning into a forest fire."

The blaze has died to a flicker. The forest fire hasn't developed. The professor of economics was wrong again. But Douglas is a patient man. As he once wrote for the *Democratic Digest,* he realizes that "an economic depression is virtually the only thing that would turn the Republicans out of power."

The voters of Illinois presumably are in for some more shuddering predictions of calamity this fall.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "SENATOR DOUGLAS OF ILLINOIS" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will you help distribute ONE MILLION COPIES of Senator Goldwater's "Platform for a Free America?" Distribution must be made within the next few weeks if it is to influence the Republican convention. Rush your order TODAY. There is an order blank for your convenience on page 4.

Vol. XVII, No. 15—Article Section II

HUMAN EVENTS

April 16, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Platform for a Free America

By SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

WE ALL HAVE HEARD much throughout our lifetimes, and seen little happen, on the subject of high taxes. Where is the politician who has not promised his constituents a fight to the death for lower taxes—and who has not proceeded to vote for the very spending projects that make tax cuts impossible?

There are some the shoe does not fit, but I am afraid not many. Talk of tax reduction has thus come to have a hollow ring. The people listen, but do not believe. And worse: as the public grows more and more cynical, the politician feels less and less compelled to take his promises seriously.

I suspect this vicious circle of cynicism and failure to perform is primarily the result of the Liberal's success in reading out of the discussion the moral principles with which the subject of taxation is so intimately connected. We have been led to look upon taxation as merely a problem of public financing: How much money does the Government need? We have been led to discount, and often to forget altogether, the bearing of taxation on the problem of individual freedom. We have been persuaded that the Government has an unlimited claim on the wealth of people, and that the only pertinent question is what portion of its claim the Government should exercise.

Accommodating the Government

The American taxpayer, I think, has lost confidence in *his* claim to his money. He has been handicapped in resisting high taxes by the feeling that he is, in the nature of things, obliged to accommodate whatever need for his wealth government chooses to assert.

The "nature of things," I submit, is quite different. Government does *not* have an unlimited claim on the earnings of individuals. One of the foremost precepts of the natural law is man's right to the possession and the use of his property. And a man's earnings are his property as much as his land and the house in which he lives. Indeed, in the industrial age, earnings are probably the most prevalent form of property.

It has been the fashion in recent years to disparage "property rights"—to associate them with greed and materialism. This attack on property rights is actually an attack on freedom. It is another instance of the modern failure to take into account the *whole* man. How can a man be truly free if he is denied the means to exercise freedom? How can he be free if the fruits of his labor are not his to dispose of, but are treated, instead, as part of a common pool of public wealth? Property and freedom are inseparable: to the extent government takes the one in the form of taxes, it intrudes on the other.

Taxing Our Freedom

Here is an indication of how taxation currently infringes on our freedom. A family man earning $4,500 a year works, on the average, twenty-two days a month. Taxes, visible and invisible, take approximately 32% of his earnings. This means that one-third, or seven whole days, of his monthly labor goes for taxes. The average American is therefore working one-third of the time for government: a third of what he produces is not available for his own use but is confiscated and used by others who have not earned it. Let us note that by this measure the United States is already one-third "socialized." The late Senator Taft made the point often. "You can socialize," he said "just as well by a steady increase in the burden of taxation beyond the 30% we have already reached as you can by government seizure. The very imposition of heavy taxes is a limit on a man's freedom."

But having said that each man has an inalienable right to his property, it also must be said that every citizen has an obligation to contribute his fair share to the legitimate functions of government.

The distribution of the government's claim is the next part of the definition. What is a "fair share?" I believe that the requirements of justice here are perfectly clear: *government has a right to claim an equal percentage of each man's wealth and no more.* Property taxes are typically levied on this basis. Excise and sales taxes are based on the same principle—though the tax is levied on a transaction rather than on property. *The principle is equally valid with regard to incomes, inheritances and gifts.* The idea that a man who makes $100,000 a year should be forced to contribute ninety per cent of his income to the cost of government, while the man who makes $10,000 is made to pay twenty per cent, is repugnant to my notions of justice.

I do not believe in punishing success. To put it more broadly, I believe it is contrary to the natural right to property to which we have just alluded—and is therefore immoral—to deny to the man whose labor has produced more abundant fruit than that of his neighbor the opportunity of enjoying the abundance he has created. As for the claim that the government *needs* the graduated tax for revenue purposes, the facts are to the contrary. The total revenue collected from income taxes beyond the twenty per cent level amounts to less than $5 billion—less than the Federal Government now spends on the one item of agriculture.

THE GRADUATED TAX is a *confiscatory* tax. Its effect, and to a large extent its aim, is to bring down all men to a common level. Many of the leading proponents of the graduated tax frankly admit that their purpose is to redistribute the nation's wealth. Their aim is an egalitarian society—an objective that does violence both to the charter of the Republic and the laws of Nature. We are all equal in the eyes of God but we are equal *in no other respect.* Artificial devices for enforcing equality among unequal men must be rejected if we would restore that charter and honor those laws.

This article is an abridgement of *The Conscience of a Conservative* (Victor Publishing Company, 123 pages, $3), by Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.), Chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee. This book may be ordered from HUMAN EVENTS at $3 per copy.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The increase in population does not begin to account for the increase in spending. During the ten-year period in which Federal spending will have increased by 143%, our population will have increased by roughly 18%. Nor does inflation account for the difference. In the past ten years the value of the dollar has decreased less than 20%.

Gross National Product

Finally, we are often told that the government's *share* of total spending in the country is what is important and consequently we must take into account the increase in gross national product. Again, however, the increase in GNP, which was roughly 40% over the past ten years, is not comparable to a 143% increase in Federal spending. The conclusion here is inescapable—that far from arresting Federal spending and the trend toward Statism we Republicans have kept the trend moving forward.

I do not mean to suggest, of course, that things would have been different under a Democratic Administration. Every year the Democratic national leadership demands that the Federal Government spend *more* than it is spending, and the Republicans propose to spend. *And this year, several weeks before President Eisenhower submitted his 1961 budget, The Democratic National Advisory Council issued a manifesto calling for profligate spending increases in nearly every department of the Federal Government; the demands for increases in domestic spending alone could hardly cost less than $20 billion a year.*

THE ROOT EVIL is that the government is engaged in activities in which it has no legitimate business. As long as the Federal Government acknowledges responsibility in a given social or economic field, its spending in that field cannot be substantially reduced. As long as the Federal Government acknowledges responsibility for education, for example, the amount of Federal aid is bound to increase, at the very least, in direct proportion to the cost of supporting the nation's schools. *The only way to curtail spending substantially is to eliminate the programs on which excess spending is consumed.*

The government must begin to *withdraw* from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate—from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal and all the other activities that can be better performed by lower levels of government or by private institutions or by individuals. I do not suggest that the Federal Government drop all of these programs overnight. But I do suggest that we establish, by law, a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal. We might provide, for example, for a 10% spending reduction each year in all of the fields in which Federal participation is undesirable. It is only through this kind of determined assault on the principle of unlimited government that American people will obtain relief from high taxes, and will start making progress toward regaining their freedom.

And let us, by all means, remember the *nation's* interest in reducing taxes and spending. The need for "economic growth" that we hear so much about these days will be achieved, not by the government harnessing the nation's economic forces, but by emancipating them. By reducing taxes and spending we will not only return to the individual the means with which he can assert his freedom and dignity, but also guarantee to the nation the economic strength that will always be its ultimate defense against foreign foes.

THE COLLECTIVISTS have not abandoned their ultimate goal—to subordinate the individual to the State—but their strategy has changed. They have learned that Socialism can be achieved through Welfarism quite as well as through Nationalization. They understand that private property can be confiscated as effectively by taxation as by expropriating it. They understand that the individual can be put at the mercy of the State—not only by making the State his employer—but by divesting him of the means to provide for his personal needs and by giving the State the responsibility of caring for those needs from cradle to grave.

Moreover, they have discovered—and here is the critical point—that *Welfarism is much more compatible with the political processes of a democratic society.* Nationalization ran into popular opposition, but the collectivists feel sure the Welfare State can be erected by the simple expedient of buying votes with promises of "free" Federal benefits—"free" housing, "free" school aid, "free" hospitalization, "free" retirement pay and so on. [The President has estimated that $15 billion will be spent by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for the fiscal year 1961. *]

Socialism Through Welfarism

I do not welcome this shift in strategy. Socialism-through-Welfarism poses a far greater danger to freedom than Socialism-through-Nationalization precisely because it *is* more difficult to combat. The evils of Nationalization are self-evident and immediate. Those of Welfarism are veiled and tend to be postponed. People can understand the consequences of turning over ownership of the steel industry, say, to the State; and they can be counted on to oppose such a proposal. But let the government increase its contribution to the "Public Assistance" program and we will, at most, grumble about excessive government spending.

The effect of Welfarism on freedom will be felt later on—after its beneficiaries have become its victims, after dependence on government has turned into bondage and it is too late to unlock the jail.

But a far more important factor is Welfarism's strong emotional appeal to many voters, and the consequent temptations it presents the average politician. It is hard, as we have seen, to make out a case for State ownership. It is very different with the rhetoric of humanitarianism. How easy it is to reach the voters with earnest importunities for helping the needy. And how difficult for Conservatives to resist these demands without appearing to be callous and contemptuous of the plight of less fortunate citizens. Here, perhaps, is the best illustration of the failure of the Conservative demonstration.

The Sick and the Aged

I know, for I have heard the questions, often. Have you no sense of social obligation? the "liberals" ask. Have you no concern for people who are out of work? for sick people who lack medical care? for children in overcrowded schools? Are you unmoved by the problems of the aged and disabled? Are you *against* human welfare?

The answer to all these questions is, of course, no. But a simple "no" is not enough. I feel certain that Conservatism is through unless Conservatives can demonstrate and communicate the difference between being concerned with these problems and believing that the Federal Government is the proper agent for their solution.

THE LONG RANGE political consequences of Welfarism are plain enough: as we have seen, the State that is able to deal with its citizens as wards and dependents has gathered unto itself unlimited political and economic power and is thus able to rule as absolutely as any oriental despot.

Let us, however, weigh the consequences of Welfarism on the individual citizen. Consider, first, the effect of Welfarism on the donors of government welfare—not only those who pay for it but also the voters and their elected representatives who decide that the benefits shall be conferred. Does some credit redound on them for trying to care for the needs of their fellow citizens? Are they to be commended and rewarded, at some moment in eternity, for their "charity?" I think not. Suppose I should vote for a measure providing for free medical care: I am unaware of any moral virtue that is attached to my decision to confiscate the earnings of X and give them to Y.

Private Charity

Suppose, however, that X approves of the program—that he has voted for welfarist politicians with the idea of

* The total figure will be substantially higher if we take into account welfare expenditures outside the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—for federal housing projects, for example.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

helping his fellow man. Surely the wholesomeness of his act is diluted by the fact that he is voting not only to have his own money taken but also that of his fellow citizens who may have different ideas about their social obligations. Why does not such a man, instead, contribute what he regards as his just share of human welfare to a private charity?

CONSIDER THE CONSEQUENCES to the recipient of Welfarism. For one thing, he mortgages himself to the Federal Government. In return for benefits—which, in the majority of cases, he pays for—he concedes to the government the ultimate in political power—the power to grant or withhold from him the necessities of life as the government sees fit. Even more important, however, is the effect on him—the elimination of any feeling of responsibility for his own welfare and that of his family and neighbors. A man may not immediately, or ever, comprehend the harm thus done to his character.

Indeed, this is one of the great evils of Welfarism—that it transforms the individual from a dignified, industrious, self-reliant *spiritual* being into a dependent animal creature without his knowing it. There is no avoiding this damage to character under the Welfare State. Welfare programs cannot help but promote the idea that the government *owes* the benefits it confers on the individual, and that the individual is entitled, by right, to receive them. Such programs are sold to the country precisely on the argument that government has an *obligation* to care for the needs of its citizens. It is possible that the message will reach those who vote for the benefits, but not those who receive them? How different it is with private charity where both the giver and the receiver understand that charity is the product of the humanitarian impulses of the giver, not the due of the receiver.

Spiritual Well-Being

Let us, then, not blunt the noble impulses of mankind by reducing charity to a mechanical operation of the Federal Government. Let us, by all means, encourage those who are fortunate and able to care for the needs of those who are unfortunate and disabled. But let us do this in a way that is conducive to the spiritual as well as the material well-being of our citizens—and in a way that will preserve their freedom. Let welfare be a private concern. Let it be promoted by individuals and families, by churches, private hospitals, religious service organizations, community charities and other institutions that have been established for this purpose. If the objection is raised that private institutions lack sufficient funds, let us remember that every penny the Federal Government does *not* appropriate for welfare is potentially available for private use—and without the overhead charge for processing the money through the Federal bureaucracy. Indeed, high taxes, for which government Welfarism is so largely responsible, is the biggest obstacle to fund raising by private charities.

Finally, if we deem public intervention necessary, let the job be done by local and state authorities that are incapable of accumulating the vast political power that is so inimical to our liberties.

The Welfare State is *not* inevitable as its proponents are so fond of telling us. There is nothing inherent in an industrialized economy, or in democratic processes of government that *must* produce de Tocqueville's "guardian society." Our future, like our past, will be what we make it. And we can shatter the collectivists' designs on individual freedom if we will impress upon the men who conduct our affairs this one truth: that the material and spiritual sides of men are intertwined; that it is impossible for the State to assume responsibility for one without intruding on the essential nature of the other; that if we take from a man the personal responsibility for caring for his material needs, we take from him also the will and the opportunity to be free.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION has created more problems that it has solved. *Farm production, like any other production, is best controlled by the natural operation of the free market.* If the nation's farmers are permitted to sell their produce freely, at prices consumers are willing to pay, they will, under the law of supply and demand, end up producing roughly what can be consumed in national and world markets. And if farmers, in general, find they are not getting high enough prices for their produce, some of them will move into other kinds of economic activity. The result will be reduced agricultural production and higher incomes for those who remain on the farms. If, however, the government interferes with this natural economic process, and pegs prices higher than the consumer is willing to pay, the result will be, in Hamilton's phrase, "troublesome." The nation will pay exorbitant prices for work that is not needed and for produce that cannot be consumed.

Self-Defeating Policy

In recent years, the government has sought to alleviate the problem of overproduction by the soil bank and acreage retirement programs. Actually, these programs are simply a modern version of the hog-killing and potato-burning schemes promoted by Henry Wallace during the New Deal. And they have been no more successful in reducing surpluses than their predecessors. But there is also a positive evil in these programs: in effect, they reward people *for not producing*. For a nation that is expressing great concern over its "economic growth," I cannot conceive of a more absurd and self-defeating policy than one which subsidizes non-production.

The problem of surpluses will not be solved until we recognize that technological progress and other factors have made it possible for the needs of America, and those of accessible world markets, to be satisfied by a far fewer number of farmers than now till the soil. I cannot believe that any serious student of the farm problems fails to appreciate this fact. What has been lacking is not an understanding of a problem that is really quite impossible not to understand, but the political courage to do something about it.

Natural Laws

Doing something about it means—and there can be no equivocation here—*prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program.* The only way to persuade farmers to enter other fields of endeavor is to stop paying inefficient farmers for produce that cannot be sold at free market prices. Is this a cruel solution? Is it heartless to permit the natural laws of economics to determine haw many farmers there shall be in the same way that those laws determine how many bankers, or druggists, or watchmakers there shall be? It was never considered so before the subsidy program began. Let us remember that the movement *from* the farm *to* other fields of endeavor has been proceeding in this country since its beginning—and with good effects, not ill.

I cannot believe that this course will lose politicians as many votes as some of them seem to fear. Most farmers want to stand on their own feet. They are prepared to take their chances in the free market. They have a more intimate knowledge than most of us of the consequences of unlimited government power, and so, it would seem, a greater interest than most in returning agriculture to freedom and economic sanity.

IF I HAD TO SELECT the vote I regard as the most important of my Senate career it would be the one I cast on the Kennedy-Ervin "Labor Reform" Bill of 1959. The Senate passed the measure 90-1; the dissenting vote was mine. The measure had been advertised as a cure-all for the evils uncovered by the McClellan Committee investigation. I opposed it because I felt certain that legislation which pretended to respond to to the popular demand for safeguards against union power, but actually did not do so, would preclude the possibility of meaningful legislation for some time to come.

Though the Landrum-Griffin Bill was an improvement over the Kennedy measure, Congress has still to come to grips with the real evil in the Labor field. Graft and corruption are symptoms of the illness that besets the labor move-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, not the cause of it. *The cause is the enormous economic and political power now concentrated in the hands of union leaders.*

Encouraging Inefficiency

Such power hurts the nation's economy by forcing on employers contract terms that encourage inefficiency, lower production and high prices—all of which result in a lower standard of living for the American people.

It corrupts the nation's political life by exerting undue influence on the selection of public officials.

It gravely compromises the freedom of millions of individual workers who are able to register a dissent against the practice of union leaders only at the risk of losing their jobs.

Political Freedom. One way we exercise political freedom is to vote for the candidate of our choice. Another way is to use our money to try to persuade other voters to make a similar choice—that is, to contribute to our candidate's campaign. If either of these freedoms is violated, the consequences are very grave not only for the individual voter and contributor, but for the society whose free political processes depend on a wide distribution of political power.

It is in the second of these areas, that of political contributions, that labor unions seriously compromise American freedom. They do this by spending the money of union members without prior consultation for purposes the individual members may or may not approve of, purposes that are decided upon by a relatively small number of union leaders. Probably the greatest spender in the labor movement is the powerful AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE) which is supported in its "educational" work entirely by union general funds.

Union Political Spending

It is impossible to say just how much unions spend on political campaigns; certainly one can't tell from the amounts officially reported, which invariably present a grossly distorted picture. In 1956, for example, Labor officially acknowledged expenditures of $941,271. According to that official report, $79,939 of the total was spent in the State of Michigan. However, a Senate investigating committee obtained evidence that in that year each of Michigan's 700,000 union members had been assessed $1.20 as a contribution to a "citizenship fund," and that this money was made available for political activities. This suggests that labor spent, from that one source alone, almost a million dollars in Michigan instead of $79,000. By projecting the difference on a nation-wide scale we get a more realistic idea of the size of Labor's political contributions.

Union political activity is not confined, of course, to direct financial contributions. In fact, this is one of its smallest endeavors. Unions provide manpower for election day chores—for making phone calls, driving cars, manning the polls and so on. Often the union members who perform these chores are reimbursed for their time-off out of union funds. Unions also sponsor radio and television programs and distribute a huge volume of printed material designed to support the candidate of the union's choice. In short, they perform all the functions of a regular party organization.

The union's decision whether to support candidate X or candidate Y—whether to help the Republican Party or Democratic Party—is not reached by a poll of the union membership. It is made by a handful of top union officers. These few men are thus able to wield tremendous political power by virtue of their ability to spend other people's money. No one else in America is so privileged.

In *The Conscience of a Conservative*, Senator Goldwater comments on other issues as follows:

The Cold War: "A tolerable peace must *follow* victory over communism . . . . We should withdraw diplomatic relations from all Communist governments including the Soviet Union. It would give heart to the enslaved peoples and help them overthrow their captors."

States Rights: "This cornerstone of our Republic, our chief bulwark against the encroachment on individual freedom by Big Government, is fast disappearing under the piling sands of absolutism. No powers regarding education were given the Federal Government. Despite the recent holding of the Supreme Court, I am firmly convinced that the Constitution does not permit any interference whatsoever by the Federal Government in the field of education."

Supreme Court: "I have great respect for the Supreme Court as an institution but I cannot believe that I display that respect by submitting abjectly to the abuses of power by the Court and by condoning its unconstitutional trespass into the legislative sphere of government."

Foreign Aid: "It is not only ill-administered but ill-conceived. It has not made the free world stronger, it has made America weaker."

Labor: "Right-to-work laws derive from the Natural Law. They are simply an attempt to give freedom of association the added protection of civil law . . . . Let us henceforth make war on all monopolies whether corporate or union . . . . The champions of freedom will fight against the concentration of power wherever they find it.

The Conscience of a Conservative is a sensational public revelation of that which is seldom if ever disclosed, namely, the heartfelt convictions of a Washington politician.

Senator Barry Goldwater is not the only member of Congress who holds these truths but he is the only person in high public office who has frankly and publicly put all these truths together into a complete and cogent program of foreign and domestic policy.

This supremely sensible and eminently courageous book will shock orthodox politicians as much as it will gratify millions of Americans who are sick and tired of political contests between meaningless equivocations and undifferentiated distinctions.

The revealed conscience of this distinguished and singularly successful political Conservative will shed helpful light on the fabrication of both political platforms.

More important than that is the clear warning this book sounds about impending dangers to the survival of American freedom and the action it recommends to avoid these dangers.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS
408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "PLATFORM FOR A FREE AMERICA" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In $5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription

☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED